

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_119403
Title of the Manuscript:	Profile of D-Dimer Levels in Patients Confirmed Positive for COVID-19 at the Indonesian Christian University Hospital
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript has a clear structure, including introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. The research question is focused on the relationship between D-dimer levels and clinical symptoms/anticoagulant administration in COVID-19 patients. The authors acknowledge limitations of the study, such as the imbalanced sample size between genders. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction is quite lengthy and repetitive. It could be concise by focusing more on the background of D-dimer and its relevance to COVID-19. Citations are missing throughout the manuscript. Referencing relevant studies would strengthen the introduction and discussion sections. Some results sections lack clear explanations. For example, the justification for the inclusion/exclusion criteria is not provided. <p>Specific comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefly summarize the clinical manifestations of COVID-19. Focus on the role of D-dimer in COVID-19 and blood clotting. Cite relevant studies to support your claims. Section 2.2.1 Research Design: Briefly explain why a retrospective cross-sectional design was chosen. Section 2.2.4 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Explain the rationale behind the age range and exclusion criteria for comorbidities. Section 3. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine and present similar data (e.g., demographics) in fewer tables for better readability. For each table, include a title and explain the key findings in the text. Section 3.2 Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the findings in the context of existing literature. Explain the potential reasons for the observed relationships (or lack thereof) between D-dimer levels, clinical symptoms, and anticoagulant administration. Briefly mention the limitations of the study and how they might affect the generalizability of the results. <p>Overall</p> <p>This manuscript has a good foundation, but it would benefit from a more concise introduction, proper citations, clearer explanations of results, and a more in-depth discussion section that integrates existing research.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the manuscript shows potential for scholarly communications, but it could be improved. Here's why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths: The structure and overall clarity suggest the authors have a good grasp of English. • Weaknesses: There are missing citations and some sections lack clear explanations. For scholarly communication, the language needs to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and objective: Avoid slang, contractions, or overly conversational language. • Precise: Use technical terms accurately and consistently. • Grammatically correct: Ensure proper grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure. <p>Here's what the authors can do to improve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proofread carefully for grammatical errors and typos. • Cite relevant sources to support their claims and strengthen the arguments. • Revise unclear sections to provide more context and explain the rationale behind their methods and findings. <p>Overall: With some revisions and proper referencing, the language quality can be suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Wesam Ahmed Nasif</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Umm Al Qura University, Saudi Arabia</p>